

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, and 16-30 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 25 are amended and claim 24 is canceled. The amendments to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 25 merely incorporate the “spring biased” recitation of dependent claims 2 and 6 into the independent claims 1, 5, and 25, as suggested by the Examiner on page 3 of the March 3, 2006 Office Action. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s allowance of claims 13 and 14.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, & 16-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1, as lacking written description for the term “movable member.” In view of the Examiner’s subsequent enablement rejection, Applicants understand this written description rejection to be that the term “movable member” lacks written description in the absence of the additional recitation, “spring biased.” While Applicants disagree and believe that the term “movable member” is adequately described in the original specification, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 5, and 25 to explicitly recite that the “movable member” is a “spring biased movable member,” as previously recited in dependent claims 2 and 6. Applicants submit that the term “spring biased movable member” is adequately described in the original specification. *See, e.g.*, original application, ¶ [0026] (“movable piece 11” and “spring assembly 12”); original claim 2 (“spring biased movable member”). Dependent claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-12, 16-23, and 26-30 also include the recitation “spring biased movable member” via their dependency from independent claims 1, 5, or 25. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the written description rejection.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, & 16-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1, as non-enabled. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the application enables a “spring biased movable member,” but not the more generic “movable member” (3/3/06 Office Action, p. 3). While Applicants disagree and believe that the term “movable member” is fully enabled by the original application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 5, and 25 as requested by the Examiner to explicitly recite that the “movable member” is a “spring biased movable member.” Dependent claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-12, 16-23, and 26-30 also include the recitation “spring biased movable member” via their dependency from independent claims 1, 5, or 25. Because the Examiner agrees that the term “spring biased movable member” is enabled (3/3/06 Office Action, p. 3), Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the non-enablement rejection.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. Applicants submit that this rejection is moot in view of the present cancellation of claim 24.

Entry of the this amendment is appropriate under 37 CFR 1.116 because (a) it places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above; (b) it does not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search; (c) it does not add any claims without canceling a corresponding number of claims; and (d) it places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of this amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Should any issues require further resolution, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss and resolve these issues. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application in view of the above remarks are respectfully requested. Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP


Benjamin L. Kiersz
Reg. No. 51,875
Tel. No. 703 770.7714
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: June 16, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
703.770.7900